DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 029 HE 013 022

AUTHOR Emerson, Barbara J.
TITLE Faculty Women's Perceptions of Sex Discrimination at Eastern Illinois University.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Females; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Sex Differences; *Sex Discrimination; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Experience; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *Eastern Illinois University

ABSTRACT

Data from a survey of 93 faculty women at Eastern Illinois University show that perceptions of sex discrimination still exist. The degree of perceived discrimination, however, is not as high as predicted. Findings also indicate that feelings of discrimination decrease as years of teaching increase, and that women in "masculine" fields perceive less discrimination than women in "neutral" or "feminine" fields. While most of the women feel that men dominate some areas in their fields, they tend to view their own fields as neutral. Also, the majority do not believe that having masculine traits will lead to enhanced success. Finally, findings indicate an optimistic outlook on present and future working conditions for women in higher education. The questionnaire used is appended. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CN003342

HEURISTICS VOL. 9 NO. 2

FACULTY WOMEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF SEX DISCRIMINATION AT EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Emerson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Barbara J. Emerson
Eastern Illinois University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED190029

ABSTRACT

Previous studies of sex discrimination in academe have focused on matters of salary, rank, promotion, tenure, status and administration. This paper examines sex discrimination from a perceptual perspective. Data from 93 faculty women show that perceptions of sex discrimination still exist. The degree of perceived discrimination, however, is not as high as predicted. Findings also indicate that feelings of discrimination decrease as years of teaching increase, and that women in masculine fields perceive less discrimination than women in neutral or feminine fields. While most of the women feel that men dominate some areas in their perspective fields, they tend to view their field as neutral. Also, the majority do not believe that having masculine traits will lead to enhanced success. Finally, findings indicate an optimistic outlook on present and future working conditions for women in higher education.

Within the past two decades, Congress has become increasingly involved in legislation dealing with women's equal rights and opportunities in the United States. Women are again organizing to fight discrimination with a strength which has not been displayed since they won the right to

---

* This paper was written as an assignment for the course, Sex Roles and Social Change, at Eastern Illinois University. It received first place honors in the Student Paper Competition at the Illinois Sociological Association Convention on October 26, 1979. I would like to express my sincere gratitude and thanks to Dr. Richard Hummel, for without his support and encouragement this paper could not have been written.

HE 013 022

vote in 1920 (Harris, 1974). As a result of this rising consciousness, Congress has passed several pieces of legislation which have dealt specifically with the problem of sex discrimination.[1]

A growing concern regarding discrimination against women faculty in colleges and universities began to materialize in the early 1970's (Hooks, 1975). Consequently, research has been conducted in order to determine the extent of the problem of six discrimination in academe.

One component which some investigators have examined concerns the quantity of female faculty employed in areas of higher learning. It is difficult to determine what the correct proportion of women faculty should be. Robinson (1973) examined 125 campus reports on college faculty women. One measure of adequate representation was to compare a specific university's percent of women faculty with the national percent. At the time of Robinson's investigation, the national percent of women college teachers was 20 percent. Of the 65 schools in which data could be obtained, the total numbers of women ranged from 2 to 35 percent. Of these institutions, 80 percent reported lower quantities than the national average, and in over 50 percent of the schools, women comprised less than 16 percent of the faculty.

In addition, Robinson examined the number of women faculty employed exclusively at elite institutions. In 13 schools which were classified as elite, women's participation as faculty ranged from only 2 to 17 percent.

In another report, the national average of faculty women during the year 1976 was cited as 24 percent. This study examined Ivy League institutions and likewise found a much smaller percentage of women faculty than the national average. For example, the percent of women in Arts and Science faculties at Harvard is 3 percent, Yale 1.6 percent, Princeton 1 percent, Stanford 5 percent, Berkeley 5.6 percent, Chicago 5 percent, and Columbia 5 percent (Graham, 1978).

A second measure which has been used to determine what the participation rate of women should be is a comparison between the percent of women graduates and the percent of women faculty. At the University of Arizona, for instance, women represented 38 percent of the graduate students in the university, but only 13 percent of its faculty. The same comparison was made within the departments and yielded similar results (Robinson, 1973).

In another study at the Urbana-Champaign campus of the University of Illinois, the percent of women awarded doctorates

nationwide in selected fields during 1967-68 was compared with the percent of women faculty employed at the assistant professor rank. Of the 23 fields selected, 13 departments showed the sex ratio of assistant professors below the ratio of recent doctoral graduates. The ten departments which had the required proportion of women did not necessarily prove nondiscrimination in hiring. The larger numbers of women at the assistant professor rank may have simply been the result of a low promotion rate (Loeb and Ferber, 1973).

Additional studies have also shown fewer women faculty employed in the academic setting than expected (Hooks, 1975; ASA FOOTNOTES, 1979; Harris, 1974).

Other evidence of sex discrimination in academe has been accumulated in relation to the ranks which female faculty hold. An investigation was conducted by Hoffman (1977) to determine to what extent female faculty members were assigned to academic rank on an equal basis with men who shared the same characteristics. Sex proved to be a significant variable in predicting rank. In other words, being female was associated with a lower rank.

Robinson (1973) studied two methods of comparison which were used to predict rank. The "within sex" method examined the percent of ranks found within each sex, and the "within rank" method compared the sexual composition of each rank. In relation to the first method, Robinson found that as a whole, over 50 percent of the male faculty held professor or associate professor rank compared to no more than 25 percent of all female faculty. This finding remained consistent in all the institutions studied. For example, at Stanford University, 50 percent of the men occupied the top two ranks compared with less than 10 percent of the women. On the other hand, 67 percent of all women were classified as research associates, instructors, or lecturers compared with only 28 percent of the men.

The second or "within rank" method of comparison was the more common method used in the university reports. Robinson examined 50 institutional reports covering 68 coeducational schools. Forty-two reports showed 10 percent or less women at the professor level and 49 of the 50 reports showed 20 percent or less women. At the associate professor level, 46 of the 50 reports found women at 20 percent or less. No report showed women comprising over 30 percent at the professor rank, and in only one report did women constitute over 30 percent at the associate professor rank. While women comprised between 11 and 40 percent at the assistant professor rank in 36 reports, 14 reports still showed women totaling 10

AUG 2 5 1980

percent or less. Women occasionally constituted over 50 percent at the instructor rank (3 of 50 cases), yet in six cases they comprised 10 percent or less. Robinson concluded that the overall figures demonstrated a definite lack of female participation in the upper three ranks.

The fact that women are plentiful in the lower ranks and scarce in the upper ranks led Robinson to suspect that discrimination in promotion may have been exercised. In a study at Indiana University in Bloomington, Robinson found that during a three-year period, women remained in rank about 1.23 years longer than men before being recommended for promotion. They also remained in rank 1.59 years longer than men before actually being promoted.

In Loeb and Ferber's (1973) study conducted at the University of Illinois, women occupied a lower rank than men even after amount of publication and years of professional experience were controlled. Another study showed comparable results (Hooks, 1975). In this study, women held inferior ranks even though their length of service and teaching capabilities were equal to men. A third study by Kilson (1976) noted that women faculty were underrepresented and concentrated in the lower ranks despite a large proportion of female students. Kilson further added that the more elite an institution, the greater the inequity between men and women.

By far, the more widely researched area of discrimination and one of considerable concern to women is that of salary inequities. A study by Gordon, Morton, and Braden (1974) attempted to determine whether discrimination in faculty salaries existed on the basis of sex. They defined sex discrimination in salary as a variable which cannot be explained by differences in individual characteristics of age, seniority, education, rank, race, or discipline. Their results indicated that a woman faculty member earned 11.4 percent less than would be expected for a man with the same characteristics.

A similar study was carried out by Hoffman (1976). She first found that by using Gordon et al's definition of discrimination, sex caused a 7.4 percent difference in salary. Hoffman then chose to eliminate rank as an explanatory variable, for she believed rank itself reflected discrimination. Results showed that when rank was omitted, the amount of discrimination nearly doubled.

Robinson (1973) reported differences between men's and women's salaries which ranged from $63 to $4,065. The largest discrepancies occurred at the full professor rank.

In a report concerning the status of women faculty at Eastern Illinois University, salaries for women teachers consistently fell below men. This remained true whether women were classified by field of study, rank, education level, personnel action, tenure status, age, class, or seniority. Specifically, being female reduced the average monthly salary by $111 (Hooks, 1975).

In another study, women's salaries were compared with men's at a large university (Katz, 1973). The mean salary for men in 1969 was $16,078 but only $11,233 for women. Factors such as productivity and experience contributed $2,435 of the difference. The remaining $2,410 was directly due to sex discrimination.

In a 1979 American Sociological Association report, the median annual salary of women doctoral sociologists was compared with men. Salaries were cross-tabulated with graduation cohorts: 1975-76, 1970-74, 1965-69, 1955-64, and 1934-54. The figures indicated lower earnings for women sociologists. The greatest difference was found in the earliest cohort. Men who graduated during 1934-54 earned $35,442 compared with $25,763 for women. The total average salary for men was $23,293 in comparison to $20,484 for women (ASA FOOTNOTES, 1979).

One final study by Johnson and Stafford (1974) looked at salary differentials in terms of male and female life cycle participation in the labor force. The most important finding demonstrated that salaries of women faculty started at 4-11 percent lower than men faculty, rose to a fairly substantial difference of 13-23 percent fifteen years after completion of the doctorate, and then slightly declined with further years of experience. Overall, Johnson and Stafford found that within a 35-year work life, three-fifths of the wage discrepancy could be traced to differences in abilities and experience, while two-fifths of the wage discrepancy was attributed to sex discrimination.

In conclusion, research has revealed that when comparing men and women in higher education, women are more apt to be hired at lower initial ranks, promoted more slowly, and given lower salaries. Even when differences in qualifications are controlled, men still receive appointments at higher ranks and earn larger salaries (Morlock, 1973).

Research examined thus far strongly suggests that sex discrimination among female faculty members does, in fact, exist. The purpose of this paper is to explore how women faculty members perceive themselves in relation to their male colleagues. In other words, do women feel any discrimination in their profession?

Very few studies have examined sex discrimination from a perceptual standpoint. Mayfield and Nash (1976) conducted one such study. They surveyed women professors at Texas A & M University to determine their career attitudes. Women were asked to respond to the question, "What difficulties or problems have you encountered as a result of being a woman in your career field?" The authors found: 17 percent felt they were not accepted by men; 32 percent felt discrimination in pay; 25 percent felt discrimination in status; 25 percent felt that they must demonstrate higher levels of performance than their male colleagues; and 40 percent felt they needed to prove their capabilities before being accepted by the male faculty.

An earlier survey was conducted on the same college campus as the present study (Franklin, 1973). Women faculty were sent questionnaires in which they were asked to respond to the question, "What do you consider the two or three major problems which face women on Eastern's faculty?" Of the 53 responses, 57 percent felt discrimination in salary, 30 percent felt there was a lack of women in administrative or chairmanship positions, 25 percent felt there was a failure or slowness to promote competent women, 17 percent felt women were stereotyped and confined to an area or level, 11 percent felt there was a lack of women on key committees, and 9 percent felt there was a shortage of women in counseling positions. Franklin's survey is significant in that it shows a general feeling of discrimination among Eastern Illinois University women faculty. Although the present study is constructed in a more detailed and systematic manner, Franklin's results can be utilized as a basis for longitudinal comparison.

Several hypotheses have been formulated in relation to the present study: (1) a substantial percent of women will continue to perceive sex discrimination. The percent, however, should be lower than that found in Franklin's (1973) survey. Statistics reveal that discrimination exists in academe today. Yet with the rising consciousness of women and attempts by the government to end discrimination, the level of perceived inequities should not be as high as was found in 1973; (2) women in the traditionally masculine fields (i.e., science, math, and business) will tend to feel more discrimination than women in other fields. Statistically, the masculine fields continue to be overwhelmingly male dominated. Thus, men in those fields may not treat treat women as equal in comparison to men in fields where women are more numerous; (3) women will tend to perceive their field of study as neutral rather than masculine or feminine. Theoretically, a field labeled as neutral

connotes men and women participating equally, while to label a field as masculine or feminine would be to agree to the field's bias toward one sex; (4) women's feelings of discrimination will decrease as their years in teaching increase. Women who have been working over 15 years most likely were hired at salaries which reflected greater inequities than today. Institutions at that time were not legally required to stop discrimination. Thus, these women will tend to compare the discrimination they felt in the past with the discrimination they feel today and as a result, will most likely perceive less discrimination; and (5) a greater number of women will show optimism toward present and future working conditions for women in higher education. Again, the demand for women's equality will bring any inequities out in the open. As a result, women will see conditions improving and tend to answer in a positive manner.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects in this study consisted of 93 out of a possible 122 full-time women faculty at Eastern Illinois University. The subjects were contacted in a randomly assigned serial order. The intent was to insure that a random sample would be obtained when the time allotted for collecting data had elapsed. Two women who were contacted refused to participate. Several women interviewed combined teaching duties with administrative responsibilities. Two women coached interscholastic sports in addition to teaching. All women who were employed part-time were sick or on sabbatical leave, held only one year contracts, or were solely in administration and were not included in the list.[2]

Instrument

A 17-item questionnaire was utilized. The questions probed five areas: 1) background information on the subject; 2) men's dominance in the field and perceived gender of the field; 3) areas of possible discrimination; 4) relations with male colleagues in the university and at the professional level; and 5) feelings toward present and future working opportunities for women. The questions were developed by the interviewer to measure perceptions of discrimination. For a complete list of the items and possible responses, see Appendix A.

Procedure

The subjects were first given a brief explanation regarding the purpose of the study and then were asked to respond to each of the 17 items. All questionnaires were administered by the interviewer in the subjects' office except when lack of privacy required the interview to take place elsewhere (e.g., in the hallway). Interviews were conducted in person to insure a greater percentage of cooperation. One subject, after being contacted in person, asked to be interviewed over the phone because of a busy schedule. The data were analyzed by means of the SPSS computer library programs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis to be tested was that a substantial percent of women would perceive discrimination. An "index of discrimination scale" was devised from eight questions probing various areas of possible discrimination. The possible scores on this index ranged from 0-8. A score of zero was classified as no discrimination; a score of one or two was classified as low discrimination; and a score of three or greater was labeled moderate to high discrimination. Only those scores of three or more were considered large enough to demonstrate definite feelings of inequity. Table 1 shows that 30.1 percent of the women perceived moderate to high levels of discrimination.

Table 1. Perceived Discrimination

No discrim.		Low discrim.		Mod-high discrim.		Total	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
32	34.4	33	35.5	28	30.1	93	100.0

The index was then decomposed into the eight questions which comprised it in order to determine in what specific areas women felt the most discrimination. Women responded the most in four areas. Table 2 shows that 36.6 percent of the women felt discrimination in pay, 33.3 percent felt that their professional advancement was hindered, 37.6 percent the standards for which they were being measured were higher than they were for men, and 31.2 percent did not believe they

Table 2. Number and Percent of Women's Perceived Discrimination in Specific Questions Comprising the Index of Discrimination Scale.

Question	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	Don't Know N	Don't Know %	Total N	Total %
Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in regard to base pay?	(34)	36.6	(53)	57.0	(6)	6.5	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in regard to your share of the budget?	(2)	2.2	(83)	89.2	(8)	8.6	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in regard to your share of research grants?	(8)	8.6	(83)	89.3	(2)	2.2	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in opportunities to attend professional society conferences, seminars, etc.?	(6)	6.5	(86)	92.5	(1)	1.1	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that you are given an equal opportunity to publish items such as papers, books, etc.?	(83)	89.2	(7)	7.5	(3)	3.2	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that your opportunities for professional advancement are hindered because you are female?	(31)	33.3	(59)	63.4	(3)	3.2	(93)	100.0
Do you feel that the standards for which you are being measured are higher than they are for men?	(35)	37.6	(55)	59.1	(3)	3.2	(93)	100.0
Do you believe that your opportunities for recognition as a professional in your field are equal to those for a man?	(61)	65.6	(29)	31.2	(3)	3.2	(93)	100.0

received equal recognition. The overall amount of women who perceived discrimination, however, did not support the hypothesis, for the majority felt very little or no discrimination.

The first hypothesis also predicted that the amount of discrimination would be lower than the amount found in Franklin's (1973) survey. Fifty-seven percent of the women in 1973 felt discrimination in pay compared to 36.6 percent of the women in the present study. In the present study, 33.3 percent of the women felt that their professional advancement was hindered. Two grievances in Franklin's survey show similar feelings. Twenty-five percent of the women felt there was a failure or slowness to promote a competent woman and 30 percent felt there was a lack of women in key administrative positions. These results show that the hypothesis was supported in regard to pay, but not supported when examining feelings toward professional advancement. Perhaps women were better able to determine the extent of discrimination in pay. For example, they could talk with their colleagues about their salaries. Furthermore, exact salary figures can be seen in a contract. But it is more difficult to judge equality when dealing with a matter such as promotion. That is a decision based on abstract and subjective material. The extent to which a person may be the object of discrimination cannot be measured as easily as salary. Thus, while government regulations may help eliminate inequities in pay, thereby lessening discrimination perceived in salary, feelings toward other areas such as promotion and recognition may remain.

The second hypothesis stated that women in the traditionally masculine fields would perceive greater discrimination.[3] Table 3 shows that the opposite, if anything, is true. No discrimination was felt by 50 percent of the women

Table 3. Perceived Discrimination and Gender of Field

Gender of field	No discrim. N	%	Low discrim. N	%	Mod-high discrim. N	%	Total N	%
feminine	14	35.0	16	40.0	10	25.0	40	100.0
neutral	14	31.1	14	31.1	17	37.8	45	100.0
masculine	4	50.0	3	37.5	1	12.5	8	100.0

in the masculine fields compared to 35 percent and 31.1 percent in feminine and neutral fields, respectively. At the same time, only 12.5 percent perceived moderate to high discrimination in the masculine fields compared to 37.8 percent in the neutral fields, and 25 percent in the feminine fields. These results run contrary to the hypothesis. One possible reason why women in masculine fields don't perceive a high degree of discrimination might be that they already proved themselves while going through graduate school. In other words, perhaps they faced a great deal of opposition while obtaining their degree, but once in the field, they may feel as if they have "made it." Another reason might be that the small percentage of women in masculine fields would not pose as great a threat to the men's positions. In fields where women comprise a larger proportion, men might feel a need to protect their jobs and consequently practice discrimination.

The third hypothesis was that women would tend to label their field neutral rather than masculine or feminine. A list of the nine categories is found in Table 4.[4] This table also shows a significant relationship between field of study and gender of field (x^2=47.1, df=16, p<.001). The only fields

Table 4. Field of Study and Gender of Field

Field of study	Masculine N	Masculine %	Feminine N	Feminine %	Neutral N	Neutral %	Total N	Total %
Eng/Libr Sci/ For Lang	3	18.8	1	6.3	12	75.0	16	100.0
Home Economics	0	0.0	7	53.8	6	46.2	13	100.0
Social Science	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0	8	100.0
Education	4	36.4	2	18.2	5	45.5	11	100.0
Math/Science	1	25.0	0	0.0	3	75.0	4	100.0
Business	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0	4	100.0
Speech/ Speech Path	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0	6	100.0
Art/Music/ Theater	1	9.1	1	9.1	9	81.8	11	100.0
PE/Health/ Recreation	1	5.0	0	0.0	19	95.0	20	100.0
Total	15	16.1	14	15.1	64	68.8	93	100.0

(x^2=47.1, df=16, p<.001)

which did not have 50 percent or more responses as neutral were Home Economics, Education, and Business. In Home Economics, 53.8 percent of the women perceived the field as feminine and in Education, feelings were divided with 36.4 percent masculine, 18.2 percent feminine, and 45.5 neutral. Of the women in business, 75 percent labeled their field as masculine. Overall, 68.8 percent of the women perceived their field as neutral, which supported the hypothesis.

In the fourth hypothesis, it was predicted that women's feelings of discrimination would decrease as their years of teaching increased. This hypothesis is supported, as can be seen in Table 5, although not to a substantial degree. The percent of women who felt no discrimination increased slightly from 30.8 percent during the first four years of teaching, to 42.1 percent between 16 and 34 years. This trend is repeated in the other two columns except with those women who

Table 5. Perceived Discrimination and Years of Teaching

Years teaching	No discrim. N	%	Low discrim. N	%	Mod-high discrim. N	%	Total N	%
1-4	8	30.8	8	30.8	10	38.5	26	100.0
5-9	8	33.3	13	54.2	3	12.5	24	100.0
10-15	8	33.3	7	29.2	9	37.5	24	100.0
16-34	8	42.1	5	26.3	6	31.6	19	100.0
Total	32	34.4	33	35.5	28	30.1	93	100.0

taught from 5 to 9 years. For instance, they comprise 12.5 percent, which is the lowest percent of those who felt moderate-high discrimination. Otherwise, there is a definite though slight decline in feelings of discrimination from 38.5 percent of those women who taught 1 to 4 years to 30.1 percent of those women who taught 16 or more years.

The last hypothesis predicted that a greater percentage of women would tend to show optimism toward present and future working conditions. Table 6 shows the responses to these two areas. As was predicted, a substantial percent did indeed feel that way. Sixty-two of the women, or 66.7 percent, felt that working conditions had improved, and 68.8 percent believed they would continue to improve in the future. Thus, the hypothesis is supported.

Table 6. Perceptions Toward Working Opportunities for Women

Question	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	Don't Know N	Don't Know %	Total N	Total %
Do you think working opportunities for women in higher education have improved since you started teaching?	(62)	66.7	(22)	24.7	(8)	8.6	(93)	100.0

	Improve N	Improve %	Deteriorate N	Deteriorate %	Same N	Same %	Total N	Total %
Do you think future opportunities for women in higher education will improve, deteriorate, or remain the same?	(64)	68.8	(5)	5.4	(24)	25.8	(93)	100.0

Two unpredicted significant relationships were found during analysis of the data. Table 7 shows a significant relationship between field of study and male dominance ($x^2=27.5$, df=8, $p<.001$). An inconsistency is found when comparing the results of Table 7 with the results of Table 4. While 100 percent of the women in Math/Science and Speech/Speech Pathology agreed that men dominated some areas in their fields, only 25 percent and 0.0 percent of the women in the two fields respectively perceived them as masculine. Perhaps these women did not think male dominance in certain areas detracted from the overall neutrality of the field.

There was also a significant relationship between years of teaching and perceptions of the value of masculine traits in achieving success in one's field ($x^2=16.7$, df=6, $p<.05$). Most of the women, or 80.65 percent, did not believe that they needed masculine traits. Only 15.1 percent of the women felt they did. But with the women who did feel success would be enhanced with masculine traits, there was a marked trend. As years of teaching increased, a belief in the necessity of masculine traits decreased. One reason for this trend might be that the inexperienced women may be more concerned about advancing in rank and being recognized as valuable individuals in the profession. Consequently, they might feel a desire to

Table 7. Field of Study and Male Dominance*

Field of Study	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	Total N	Total %
Eng/Lib Sci/For Lang	10	62.5	6	37.5	16	100.0
Home Economics	2	15.4	11	84.6	13	100.0
Social Science	7	87.5	1	12.5	8	100.0
Education	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	100.0
Math/Science	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Business	4	100.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
Speech/Speech Path	6	100.0	0	0.0	6	100.0
Art/Music/Theater	9	81.8	2	18.2	11	100.0
PE/Health/Recreation	14	70.0	6	30.0	20	100.0
Total	65	69.9	28	30.1	93	100.0

(x^2=27.5, df=8, p<.001)
* Do you feel that some areas in your field are dominated more by men than by women?

Table 8. Feelings About Masculine Traits and Years of Teaching*

Years teaching	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	Don't know N	Don't know %	Total N	Total %
1-4	8	30.8	18	69.2	0	0.0	26	100.0
5-9	4	16.7	19	79.2	1	4.2	24	100.0
10-15	2	8.3	22	91.7	0	0.0	24	100.0
16-34	0	0.0	16	84.2	3	15.8	19	100.0
Total	14	15.1	75	80.6	4	4.3	93	100.0

(x^2=16.7, df=6, p<.05)
* Do you believe that if you adapted more masculine traits, your opportunities for success and recognition would be enhanced?

be aggressive and assertive, labeling these traits as masculine. More experienced women, however, may have already achieved the success and recognition they wanted and don't feel the competition quite as strongly. In addition, they

may have come to view traits such as assertiveness and aggressiveness not as being masculine, but merely as being traits which anyone needs to possess, to achieve recognition in his/her field.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data concerning Eastern Illinois University's women faculty have indicated that for the most part, perceptions of sex discrimination still exist. Although the majority feel little or no discrimination, about one-third of the women do. Results indicate that feelings of inequity are concentrated in pay, professional advancement, measurement standards, and recognition. Furthermore, it was shown that the older, more experienced teachers did not feel as much discrimination as the less experienced teachers.

With regard to fields of study, women perceive less discrimination in masculine oriented fields. This result may have been due to the small number of women interviewed in the masculine fields. This weakness could not be eliminated unless (1) the university in the present study hired additional women in the masculine fields, or (2) the study was repeated at a larger university which employed more women in these fields.

The data show that female faculty are more likely to view their fields as neutral rather than masculine or feminine. This finding corresponds to an overall trend in society not to label jobs or professions as masculine or feminine. Yet most women recognize the fact that men still play the dominant role in various areas of the work force. This was shown in the present study by comparing fields of study with perceptions of male dominance in those fields.

Another interesting pattern was that women didn't feel they had to use masculine traits to achieve success and recognition. Masculine traits such as assertiveness and aggressiveness were either viewed as unnecessary or characteristic of anyone desiring to advance in his/her profession.

Finally, women showed positive feelings toward their working conditions and looked to the future with increasing optimism. While the present study deals only with women's perceptions, additional research regarding women's actual salaries, ranks, promotions, etc. could be undertaken. Then the perceptual data could be compared with actual statistics to see how closely the two were correlated. The additional research could also be compared longitudinally with Hooks'

(1975) study to determine what improvements, if any, had been made in eliminating sex discrimination at Eastern Illinois University.

APPENDIX A--QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How many years have you been teaching at the college level? _____
2. What field are you in? _____
   a. Have you specialized in any area of your field?
      yes _____ no _____
   b. Do you feel that some areas in your field are dominated more by men than by women?
      yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
3. Do you consider your field to be "masculine," "feminine," or "neutral"? _____
4. Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in regard to base pay (salary)?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
5. Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in regard to your share of the budget (books, equipment, visual aids)?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
6. Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in your share of research grants?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
7. Do you feel that you are being discriminated against in opportunities to attend professional society conferences, seminars, etc.?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
8. Do you feel that you are given an equal opportunity to publish items such as papers, books, etc.?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
9. Do you feel that your opportunities for professional advancement are hindered because you are female (wait longer, prove yourself more)?
   yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
10. Do you feel that the standards for which you are being measured are higher than they are for men (higher output, better quality work)?
    yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
11. Do you believe that your opportunities for recognition as a professional in your field are equal to those for men?
    yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
12. Do you believe that if you adapted more "masculine" traits your opportunities for success and recognition would be enhanced?
    yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
13. Do you feel that working opportunities for women in higher education have improved since you started teaching?
    yes _____ no _____ don't know _____
14. Do you think future opportunities for women in higher education will improve, deteriorate, or stay the same?

NOTES

[1] The laws and regulations which deal with sex discrimination include: (1) The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment passed in 1868 which denies states the right to deprive any person of equal protection of the laws; (2) Executive Order 11246 of 1965 as amended by 11375 of 1967 which prohibits sex discrimination by any employer who has a contract with the Federal Government over $10,000; (3) Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 which forbids sex discrimination in employment; and (4) Equal Pay Act of 1963 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972 which prohibits sex discrimination in professional workers' salaries. Specifically, Title IX of the Education Amendment Act of 1972 threatens to withdraw Federal funds from institutions of higher learning if women are excluded, denied benefits, or discriminated in any other way (Ross, 1973; Hooks, 1975).

[2] After the data had been collected and analyzed, it was discovered that three part-time faculty had unknowingly been included. Because of the anonymity of the subjects, it was impossible to remove them. The author does not believe that these subjects introduce any significant bias into the data.

[3] In combining the fields of study into three groups, I classified English, Library Science, Foreign Language, Home Economics, and Education as feminine; Social Science, Speech, Speech Pathology, Art, Music, Theater, Physical Education, Health, and Recreation as neutral; and Math, Science and Business as masculine.

[4] In order to provide greater clarity, I reduced the nine categories to the four categories of Social Science, Education, Math/Science, and Business. The specific fields which make up these categories include: 1) Social Science: Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, and Political Science; 2) Education: Elementary Ed., Special Ed., Business Ed., Junior High Ed., and Educational Psychology; 3) Math/Science: Math, Chemistry, Geology, and Zoology; and 4) Business: Accounting, Data Processing, and Finance.

REFERENCES

Franklin, Jimmie L.
1973 "Poll of Women Faculty." Eastern Illinois University: Affirmative Action Office.

Gordon, Nancy M., Thomas E. Morton, and Ina C. Braden
1974 "Faculty Salaries: Is There Discrimination by Sex, Race, and Discipline?" American Economic Review 64: 419-427.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg
1978 "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in American Higher Education." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 3: 759-773.

Harris, Ann Sutherland
1974 "The Second Sex in Academe." In Stacey, J, S. Bereaud, and J. Daniels (eds.), And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc. Pp. 293-316.

Hoffman, Emily P.
1976 "Faculty Salaries: Is There Discrimination by Sex, Race, and Discipline? Additional Evidence." American Economic Review 66: 196-198.

1977 "Determinants of Faculty Rank: The Discriminant Analysis Approach." Quarterly Review of Economics and Business 17: 79-88.

Hooks, Janet M.
1975 "The Status of Women Faculty at Eastern Illinois University, 1972-73." Research Report. Department of Economics, Eastern Illinois University.

Johnson, George E. and Frank P. Stafford
1974 "The Earnings and Promotion of Women Faculty." American Economic Review 64: 888-903.

Katz, David A.
1973 "Faculty Salaries, Promotions, and Productivity at a Large University." American Economic Review 63: 469-477.

Loeb, Jane W. and Marianne A. Ferber
1973 "Representation, Performance, and Status of Women on the Faculty at the Urbana-Champaign Campus of

the University of Illinois." In Rossi, A. S. and A. Calderwood (eds.), Academic Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 239-254.

Mayfield, Betty and William R. Nash
1976 "Career Attitudes of Female Professors." Psychological Reports 39: 631-634.

Morlock, Laura
1973 "Discipline Variation in the Status of Academic Women." In Rossi, A. S. and A. Calderwood (eds.), Academic Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 255-312.

Robinson, Lora H.
1973 "Institutional Variation in the Status of Academic Women." In Rossi, A. S. and A. Calderwood (eds.), Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. Pp. 199-238.

Ross, Susan C.
1973 The Rights of Women. U.S.A.: The American Civil Liberties Union, Inc.

Wilkinson, Dorris
1979 "A Report: Status of Women in Sociology, 1934-1977." ASA FOOTNOTES 7: 4-6.